UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

ARE WE FACING WAR IN ASIA?

Taraknath Das

William C. Rivers

J. Max Weis

An Open Letter to the American Red Cross - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

Selling Pacifism - - *Myles D. Blanchard*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 5

Chicago, November 4, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 67
Jottings—J. H. H. 70
ARTICLES—
An Open Letter to the American Red Cross—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 70
Are We Facing War in Asia?—A Symposium
I. By TARAKNATH DAS 72
II. By WILLIAM C. RIVERS 73
III. By J. MAX WEIS 74
Selling Pacifism—MYLES D. BLANCHARD 75
On the Pacifist Front—XXV 77
POETRY—
Ballad—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 76
Wish in Wartime—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 79
THE STUDY TABLE—
Great Preachers—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 78
An American Humanitarian—C. A. HAWLEY 79
"Conflict"—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 79
CORRESPONDENCE—
The War, the East, and America—BLANCHE WATSON 80
THE FIELD—
Speed, Speed the Food Ships!—MURIEL LESTER 66
The Liquor Situation in the United States—GEORGE L. THOMPSON, from the *Christian Leader* 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Speed, Speed the Food Ships!

A commonsense sort of war work awaits us all. It needs no training, only imagination. It can be done in one's spare time or can fill sixteen hours of one's day.

This work is nothing less than the feeding of Europe. Numerous difficulties and obstacles immediately leap to one's mind. But we are accustomed to difficulties and obstacles. We have learned throughout the ages how to circumvent them, by passion and pity.

Let us send shipload after shipload of our surplus food to Europe. Let us distribute it ourselves.

Let us grow even more food to load up this sort of Armada—American 1940 style. It will be a new sort of invasion, an entering wedge into the old fashioned unscientific surgery of Europe. Perhaps it will prove to be a new page of history written in gold letters for all the world to read, America's impact on Europe's body politic.

Let us examine the obvious snags: 1. Britain won't let the ships get past their blockade of continental Europe. 2. Hitler won't let the ships get past his submarine blockade of Britain.

Only insofar as the leaders of each country depend on starving out women and children can they object to this action of the U. S. A. The vast mass of the common people of Europe, British and continental, will hail it as sublime commonsense. After all, it will only be implementing the resolution put forward a few months ago at Westminster by the Bishop of Birmingham before the Hours of Convocation, that "We should feed our enemies." None of the high ecclesiastics present could support his plea. Sorrowfully, though sincerely, they pointed out that Britain's national policy made it impossible. Then they waited for the Bishop's reply to their regretful speeches. But he had nothing to say, except that it wasn't he who originated the idea.

Numerous Britons agree with the Bishop rather than with the starvation method. They remember the last blockade in 1918 and 1919, that long after the Armistice and long after the Peace Treaty was signed, children were to be seen in the parks and the streets of German cities, children whose bones bent if you put even a little pressure upon them, children whose bodies were described as "flimsy."

The British don't want Dutch or German, Belgian or French children to get like that.

Nor do German people want British children to get like that.

We Americans, who are free to act and speak, don't want any children anywhere to get like that.

God doesn't want any children to get like that. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

If Hitler refuses to call off his U-Boats from the food ships bound for Britain, his people may make him change his mind.

(*Continued on page* 80)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1940 No. 5

THE COMING OF WAR

The bells will peal, long-haired men will dress in golden sacks to pray for successful slaughter. And the old story will begin again.

The editors of the daily press will begin virulently to stir men up to hatred and manslaughter in the name of patriotism, happy in the receipt of an increased income. Manufacturers, merchants, contractors for military stores will hurry joyously about their business, in the hope of double receipts.

All sorts of Government officials will buzz about, foreseeing a possibility of purloining something more than usual.

The military authorities will hurry hither and thither, drawing double pay and rations, and with the expectation of receiving for the slaughter of other men various silly little ornaments which they so highly prize, as ribbons, crosses, orders and stars.

Idle ladies and gentlemen will make a great fuss, entering their names in advance for the Red Cross Society, and ready to bind up the wounds of those whom their husbands and brothers will mutilate; and they will imagine that in so doing they are performing a most Christian work.

And, smothering despair within their souls by songs, licentiousness, and wine, men will trail along, torn from peaceful labor, from their wives, mothers and children—hundreds of thousands of simple-minded, good-natured men with murderous weapons in their hands—anywhere they may be driven.

They will march, freeze, hunger, suffer sickness, and die from it, or finally come to some place where they will be slain by thousands or kill thousands themselves with no reason—men whom they have never seen before, and who neither have done or could do them any mischief.

And when the number of sick, wounded and killed become so great that there are not hands enough left to pick them up, and when the air is so infected with the putrefying scent of the "food for powder" that even the authorities find it disagreeable, a truce will be made, the wounded will be picked up anyhow, the sick will be brought in and huddled together in heaps, the killed will be covered with earth and lime, and once more all the crowd of deluded men will be led on and on till those who have devised the project, weary of it, or till those who thought to find it profitable receive their spoil.

Leo Tolstoi.

ELECTION DAY

In how many other countries of the world can the citizens exercise the power which American citizens are going to exercise on this coming election day? Germany and Russia still have elections as a matter of form, but they mean nothing as expressions of the democratic process. With one party in the field, and terroristic orders issued as to how to vote, elections in these countries are not so much a mockery as an insult. Italy has not had an election for so long that the people must have forgotten how to vote. England's parliament is still functioning, but elections have been postponed, we imagine, "for the duration," and upon the outcome of the war hangs the question of their resumption. As for the smaller countries of Europe, most of them have disappeared; and the remainder, with the possible exception of Switzerland and Mexico, and certain South American lands, are existing under conditions hardly recognizable as democratic. But in America the will of the people is still consulted according to the terms of the constitution under which we live. On election day the people are going to vote on the question as to whether they want to get rid of Mr. Roosevelt, or install him for another four years in office. This is a healthy process, and the campaign has done us all good and not harm. We remember the people, six months ago, who wanted to suspend the election, so that the nation might not be rent by political disputation. There was Dorothy Thompson's extraordinary suggestion that, in the interest of national unity, the two old parties get together and thus combine on a single ticket—i. e., Roosevelt and Willkie. These ideas were all born of an unworthy fear, and of a fundamental distrust alike of democracy and the American people. We have had our campaign, vigorously and even bitterly contested, and in spirit, if not in opinion, we are more united than ever. Indeed, we regret that the campaign was not more fiercely fought on more sharply contrasted issues. Mr. Willkie endorsed too many of Mr. Roosevelt's policies, and went along all too wholeheartedly with the President on the issues of war and peace. But democracy was basically vindicating itself in this campaign, and stands justified beyond all the fears and fallacies of the hour. America is secure in its inward integrity; and secure also, we believe, in its outward position. We are *not* going totalitarian—not unless we foolishly go into the war!—and Hitler is *not* going to invade this country (and if he does, he won't get a hundred miles beyond European waters!). So be of good cheer. America isn't lost yet!

THE CONSCRIPTION "BUNK"

Of all the familiar "bunk" perpetrated in the name of war, none is quite so disgusting as the "bunk" in connection with the Conscription Act. On registration day (October 16) the newspapers united in one great

chorus of acclaim of the millions of young men who began the glad march in support of Uncle Sam. This was the answer of America to Hitler—"the response of free men," said the New York *Times,* "to a sense of common peril"! President Roosevelt himself led the vanguard of pretense when he spoke of "more than sixteen million young Americans reviving the 300-year-old American custom of the muster." But what we seem to remember is that "the muster" was a purely voluntary enrollment for armed service of the state—the free action of "free men." But this conscription measure is compulsory. It was enacted for no other reason, according to its sponsors, than the fact that the voluntary system of enlistment could not be counted upon to supply the army needed for our home defense. Every notice of registration day announced in bold, black type that all men between 21 and 35 "*must* register." A penalty of five years in prison, or $10,000 fine, or both, was laid down as applying to any and all who disobeyed the nation's summons. When a group of theological students in New York announced that they would not register, the director of the draft, Colonel McDermott, cited the dreadful penalty imposed by the law, and promised to "crack down" instantly upon all who did not heed. This was the "muster" that the President talked about! Now, as to the right of a government to enact and enforce a conscription act, and exact obedience of its citizens, we do not at this point raise any question. This involves problems altogether apart from war, and in quite another field of theory and argument. Granting this right as an elementary function of government, we simply insist that we recognize and confess what we are doing—that, by due method of authority and compulsion, with threats of dire punishment, we are seizing upon the young men of the nation and forcing them into the army. To hide this process under a vast pretention of glad espousal of war for the nation's sake is as dishonest as it is disgusting. We have gotten to a time in history when most men no longer have any use for war or any desire to fight, and therefore they have to be compelled to take up arms. This may be good or bad, according to the point of view; but it is what it *is,* and let us, for sheer decency's sake, admit it.

ENGLAND STANDS

As a military spectacle, the defense of England will rank, we believe, with the immortal sagas of history. But even this pales into insignificance as compared with the endurance of the English people under the assault of German bombs. These people, be it noted, are not defending their country. They have not taken up arms —these myriads of men, women, and children hiding in underground shelters from the incredible fury of the skies. These people are not fighters but *victims*—victims of a cataclysm more terrible than any natural convulsion of earth. London, these dreadful days and nights, has been as though in the grip of earthquakes and tornadoes. Nothing has been spared the inhabitants in terms of horror, pain, and death. Yet there they stand, as unperturbed and unbeaten as in that first hour when the first bomb came tumbling from the clouds. Such heroism makes rather cheap and easy the heroism of the battlefield. The soldier is trained for such experience. His body is hardened, his nerves tuned, and his mind prepared. He is equipped with every offensive and defensive weapon to give him aid. He is relieved of all anxiety for the weak and helpless. No soldier is sent to the front until he is physically, mentally, and psychologically fit for the ordeal before him. But the English city-dweller is precipitated into the hell of bombardment without discipline or training, and surrounded by dependents dearer to him than his own life. Down upon his very home come tumbling the dread missiles of death. And he does not run away, nor complain, nor suffer shell shock. On the contrary, he stands up to it with cheerful heart and helping hand, and, without relief, not only endures the worst, but performs the routine tasks of his employment. Than this spectacle of civilian courage in the face of unparalleled disaster and sheer horror, the world has seen nothing more splendid in all its history. Is it English fibre that stands this strain? Is there something in the English heart, as in the English oak, which makes this epic of heroic endurance possible? We prefer to believe that it is human nature—the stuff of manhood proving its innate divinity. If we had reports from Berlin, we would undoubtedly find German men and women sustaining English bombardments with the same magnificent resolution, just as in China the Chinese people have sustained Japanese bombardments for three years past. Yes, it is simple human nature that we see in these terrific spectacles. But it is the English about whom today we know the most, and so we salute them and pray for their speedy relief.

THE QUAKERS

Pacifists are not popular, but Quakers are. Our militarist friends are never tired of denouncing and ridiculing pacifists, yet we search our mind in vain for a memory of even the most ferocious militarist denouncing and ridiculing Quakers. Militant churchmen like Bishop Manning pour out their contempt upon pacifists, but never once include the Quakers in their diatribes. Yet Quakers are pacifists, first among all pacifists, supreme exemplars of the Christian tradition of nonviolence. Why this distinction? Why are Quakers immune from the reproach that falls upon their fellows? Why are they heeded and respected, even honored, while all other pacifists are outlawed? Are there reasons? There are—and good ones! First, the Quakers have proved their case. For more than three centuries they have stood by their pacifist ideals, suffered for them, died for them, and therewith have won a stamp of

integrity like the "sterling" stamp upon a piece of silver. The Quaker knows what he means, and means what he says. His convictions on war and peace are no recent discovery, emerge out of no temporary reaction to a current war, are mixed up with no politics and no party-line economics. On the contrary, these convictions are rooted deep in the soil of a religious faith which has stood the test of time. Therefore, when a Quaker appears before the bar of judgment, he does not have to argue his case. This case is argued for him by what he is. Secondly, the Quakers are not content with faith. They believe, with St. James, that "faith without works is dead." Therefore, they busy themselves in conceiving and executing deeds of constructive beneficence in the service of mankind. Not satisfied with refusing to fight, they seek out the danger spots of the war-stricken areas, and there labor unceasingly to heal the wounds and repair the ravages of war. Like the soldier, the Quaker lays down his life—not to kill but to save his fellowmen! Again, the Quakers are themselves exemplars of what should be the personal virtues of pacifism. They know no rancor or ill will; they indulge no hatred. They are gentle in their ways, kindly in their spirit; they love even their enemies. They present in the discipline of their own lives the positive side of pacifism which is the exercise of that spiritual power which is mightier far than all the material power of earth. In the Quakers, pacifism becomes not merely a protest against war, but a potent force for peace. It is revealed as not fanaticism, least of all cowardice, but a way of life—and a successful way of life! God bless the Quakers!

WOULD YOU BELIEVE IT?

The war panic in this country seems not to abate. How can it, when the administration in Washington is still "hell bent" for scaring us to death? But the daily recurring evidences of hysteria remain none the less incredible. For example: In New York the Assistant State Health Commissioner, Dr. V. A. Van Volkenburgh, is recommending that an immediate study be made of reception places outside of New York City to which the populace could be evacuated in the event of an enemy attack. * * * Governor Lehman has shut off all access to the water supply reservoirs of New York by declaring a six months' "emergency." * * * Defense experts are considering storing war reserves of gasoline in some of Kentucky's many natural caves. Representative Vincent, Democrat, says that War Department officials agree that the caves could easily be made bomb-proof. * * * Vassar College, the famous institution of higher learning for women, has organized an Emergency Defense Council, to formulate plans of action for the defense of the country. * * * Mrs. Eva Brauer, of Jersey City, N. J., received a package in the mail. Fearing a bomb, she called the police, who soaked the package, and then opened it to find "a harmless commercial product." * * * Mayor La Guardia, of New York, has appointed a Defense Council of 62 members, to prepare plans for the defense of the city from attack by the enemy. * * * Harold De Vries, of 208 W. 14th Street, New York, has organized, under the name of the Air Raid Precautions Bureau of America, the first air raid precautions business in the county. "We don't intend," he states, "to construct any air raid structures, but to begin with advice to folks who might be worried." * * * Hendrik Willem Van Loon has published a book, *Invasion*, describing a Nazi invasion of America in the year 1940, or thereabouts. * * * A bill has been passed by Congress for the protection of homing pigeons as a measure of war preparedness. This bill was sensibly vetoed by President Roosevelt on the ground that this was carrying the defense program of the country a little too far. * * * Dean Gildersleeve is organizing a defense program at Barnard, the college for women affiliated with Columbia University. * * * And the New York stock market climbs slowly up and up as the war goes on and on. * * * It would be easy to argue that we are getting a grand kick out of the European war, just as we had the time of our lives in the last war. It's fun to be scared! But it's also dangerous—and terribly expensive when you come to pay the price. It would be well all around if we calmed down a bit.

SIR WILFRED GRENFELL

We have always been glad that Wilfred Grenfell, dead on October 9th last, was made a knight by his King, for it always seemed to us that Sir Wilfred exemplified better than any other man of our generation the old medieval conception of knighthood. At its best, the knight of chivalry was a gentleman deeply touched by a social emotion. Conscious of evil in the world from which the weak and helpless suffered, he went forth armed with sword and shield to redress wrong and establish security. His self-appointed task was to slay the monsters which devoured children, held maidens in captivity, and even daunted strong men. Such a knight in our time was Wilfred Grenfell. Early in his career, he found a land, Labrador, where men and women sought a precarious and dangeous living in a forlorn country, amid the besetting horrors of unhealed injuries and uncured diseases. These Labradorians, in other words, had no medical or other care. In this modern age they lived like the people of a thousand years ago who knew nothing of medicine and surgery. The dragons that devoured them were cold, famine, illness, and peril of life and limb. With enlightenment and progress everywhere else, these isolated folk had been quite forgotten. Once discovered, they became the passion of Sir Wilfred's soul. He labored for them as David Livingstone labored for the natives of darkest Africa. Taking the weapons of the modern knight—not sword and shield, but the surgeon's knife and the

physician's medicine kit—he went to this icebound land, and devoted himself utterly to the neglected people there. As his work became known, he was given funds for the equipment of his work, and hospitals and medical stations began soon to appear. But it was the little vessel that sailed the coast and visited the remotest villages in the most inaccessible inlets that remained the distinctive feature of his heroic labors. Sir Wilfred was a great physician in a spiritual as well as a scientific sense. Deeply religious in his own heart, he ministered to the souls as well as to the bodies of his people. His compassion was infinite, his labors untiring, his love for his kind of a profound tenderness and beauty. All through the land of Labrador his name is blessed, and to generations yet unborn his memory will be as a beacon shining amid the dark and cold.

Jottings

"Let justice be done though the heavens fall!" This is a good saying, but we think we know a better—and a truer. *Let justice be done, and the heavens will not fall!* Why not?

It is when we read that "Boss" Hague, of Jersey City, is Vice-Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, that we ponder what that word "Vice" really means.

In the last election, the *Literary Digest* poll showed that Roosevelt was going to be defeated, and the Gallup poll showed that he was going to be elected. Gallup was right, and the *Literary Digest* disappeared. This year the Gallup poll shows that Roosevelt is going to be elected, and the Dunn poll shows that he is going to be defeated. Which one of these two polls is now about to follow the *Digest* poll into oblivion? What is a poll worth anyhow?

John B. Kelly, appointed by the President to formulate a nation-wide health program as a preparedness measure, has now in hand a plan to "toughen Americans." The phrase is eloquent. To "toughen" is just what we need, in more ways than one, to get ready for war.

War casualties in Great Britain, up to October 10, amounted to a total of 59,577. Civilian casualties were 8,500 killed and 13,000 wounded, a total larger than that of any one of the three armed services. More civilians killed and wounded on city streets than sailors at sea, or soldiers in Flanders and elsewhere, or airmen over London. That's what war has come to. And there are those who believe in it!

President Roosevelt blames the draft on Germany, Italy, and Japan. When and if we go into the war, he will blame our action on Germany, Italy, and Japan. Thus has America fallen so low in power and independence as to submit her policies to the dictates of the totalitarian governments of the world.

J. H. H.

An Open Letter to the American Red Cross

To the Chairman and Directors,
The American Red Cross,
Washington, D. C.
Gentlemen:

The pitiless horrors and continuous nightmare of the European and Asiatic wars—now linked officially by the Pact of Berlin, aimed as a sinister warning against the abandonment of lawful neutrality by the United States Government—threaten to destroy in total warfare what little there is left of Christian and democratic civilization in the Western World, including even the United States. Already the poison is at work, conscripting our youth, corrupting our judgment, and undermining the moral bulwarks of our historic aloofness from the deadly imperial duels and armored fatalism of the Old World.

American civilization and liberty will be undone by its ostensible friends, if the war long continues and present trends are not strongly counteracted by the latent intelligence of the plain people. Among the worst aspects of the whole catastrophe is the near-frustration of all the more humane and constructive impulses of our citizens, and their sense of helpless resignation in the face of perils and of crimes that ought to be actively resisted, at the very least by large-scale and effective relief measures, for which we have had a deserved and creditable international reputation. Deeply and tragically significant is the fact that the American National Red Cross itself is unable to carry forward—save in England, to which all of its supplies are going—its international and neutral relief work among the European victims of this unprecedentedly frightful war, by reason of the merciless starvation-blockade of the British Government and Admiralty, now tightened against the entire Continent. Millions of dollars contributed by the generosity of the American people, and appropriated by the Congress for this purpose, lie idle because of this intolerable situation. This was not the case during the first World War, when the Red Cross and other American relief agencies were able to operate all over Europe, outside of Germany and Austria.

Under such extraordinary circumstances, one is justified in proposing and attempting things that might appear to be fantastic, or impossible, under less ab-

normal conditions, in order to break through the wall of total warfare, of terror, and misunderstanding which divides the belligerents; and in order to bring sensible people into some kind of useful collaboration for the relief of relievable human misery. It is evident that the most desirable goal would be some avenue of limited international coöperation under the banners of mercy, for the administration, and in the name, of which the International Red Cross Society was founded at Geneva, long ago. We mean specifically coöperation between Red Cross and other relief agencies *across* the belligerent frontiers. Here, then, is a concrete proposal in the present emergency. It may be more practicable than Mr. Hoover's plan.

The British desire to evacuate thousands of their children from the terrors of the Blitzkrieg, but they dare not send any large contingents out of their besieged island-fortress, because they do not sufficiently control the seas to ensure the safety of transportation across the Atlantic. (Since the torpedoing of the *City of Benares,* in September, with the loss of over 200 lives, no refugees are being permitted to leave England.) For similar reasons, we who desire to aid them are unwilling to risk American ships in the war zone, even for the sake of rescuing children whom the Administration has agreed to receive by a relaxation of the immigration regulations. On the other hand, beyond the smoking Channel and the smitten coasts of France and Holland, the Germans are unable to relieve the growing distress among their own children, as among the conquered populations, because of the British blockade of all essential imports of medical and food supplies, particularly of fats, sugar, and grains for beast and man. The glut of these same foodstuffs is a mounting embarrassment in the economic life of the Western Hemisphere; and in the want of an economic system, or mechanism, able to distribute the surpluses to the areas and human elements in greatest need, wars and dictatorships arise; so America finds itself maneuvered into a situation and an attitude similar to that of the dog-in-the-manger, contrary to its own desires.

Suppose, now, that the old and honorable German Red Cross Society, headed by the Duke of Saxe-Coburg, who visited the United States recently, should be able to obtain permission from the German Government to send out one or more unarmed German merchant-ships, under the Red Cross flag—to send them out, in ballast, bound for New York, provided that the American Red Cross should be able to obtain assurance of safe conduct from the British Admiralty. Suppose that such a ship, or ships, were then directed to proceed to certain designated British ports, there to pick up groups of English child refugees from the Blitzkrieg and carry them safely to New York. (German submarines can be trusted not to sink a German ship!) In exchange for this humane service, the German ship in New York, its living freight disembarked to be cared for by the appropriate American committees, is there and then to be laden with a cargo of American medical and relief supplies, under the charge of American Red Cross officials. Blankets against the cold of the approaching winter—urgently needed by refugees in France—and even certain foodstuffs of little nutritive value, such as coffee, valuable chiefly as a symbol of American good will, might also be sent.

So laden, the good-will ship, or fleet, is to proceed under German navigation to some designated port in France—preferably unoccupied France—still under safe conduct from the British—the German authorities to give a pledge (as they have, in fact, already done), that the distribution of all American relief supplies may be carried out under the absolute control of American relief officials and neutral agencies accompanying and receiving them. What is to prevent the successful operation of such a service?

We have some reason to think that the requisite consent and coöperation of the German authorities could be obtained, if properly sought, although they might, conceivably, demur at carrying only British children across the Atlantic unless certain German and Dutch and French children, suffering under British aerial punishment, should likewise be rescued. We can see no fair objection, and even real advantage, in that proviso, for healing friendships would undoubtedly spring up among the English and other children, refugees from terror; and a spirit of honest neutrality certainly ought to govern the whole enterprise. It could not be carried out in any other spirit.

The principal difficulty will lie, we predict, in persuading the British Government—even in exchange for the safe transportation of shiploads of their endangered children—to allow a single cargo of medical and relief supplies to reach the Continent. But we think that the attempt ought to be made and made urgently, now—and that the Red Cross is the best agency, perhaps, to make it, supported by the Quakers and the other friends of a humanity that is engaged in committing collective suicide with American acquiescence.

The sheer audacity and fairness of the project, with the dawning realization that blockade and Blitzkrieg are murderous weapons that two sides can employ to a totally dismal end, would, we venture to think, appeal to enough sensible persons in England—if the scheme were given widespread publicity and not snuffed out by the censors—to win through, eventually, the armor plate of official British reserve and to overcome unworthy rejection. Even if but one shipload of refugees and relief supplies should get through, and make the hazardous circuit, the consequences of such an experiment would be greatly desirable. Something like a miracle of communication, might happen that would open a few doors of mercy in the resounding prison-house and torture-chambers of Europe. Once tried, the experiment might develop into significant proportions, with a saving of official face all around.

We submit the idea of this coöperative mercy-service earnestly, believing that it may be an antidote to the poisonous frustration and moral paralysis of the time; and that it is worthy of adventurous experiment in a grim and desperate hour. We do not imagine that the passage back and forth of such refugee-laden ships and relief supplies under the flag of the International Red Cross would stop the insanity and total depravity of this desperate war. But only some bold initiative on a new tack, in a new spirit of aggressive neutrality and humane purpose devoid of commercial profit can possibly start the subterranean milk-of-human-kindness flowing, in howsoever small a trickle, across the quaking frontiers, where Fear and Hate stand guard. Fascism and the spirit of revenge flourish in isolation. Nothing less than imaginative statesmanship and Christian courage will ever succeed in civilizing it. All is lost for the absence of it. No one doubts that you have the courage, if given a chance. Have you the statesmanship?

"Pro Patria per Orbis Concordiam"

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Ravinia, Illinois.
October 5, 1940.

Are We Facing War in Asia?

A SYMPOSIUM*

1. Address by Dr. Taraknath Das, of the College of the City of New York

It is clear to all students of world politics that the present war between the British Empire and her allies on one side and Nazi Germany and her partners on the other, is nothing but a continuation of the World War of 1914-1918, in which the United States of America was one of the active participants on the side of Great Britain and her allies.

Long before the outbreak of the first World War, the United States, to all practical purposes, was extending diplomatic support to the Triple Entente Group of Powers (Britain, France, and Czarist Russia) against the Central Powers. Just as soon as the combat phase of the World War broke out, the United States became a partner of the Entente-allies in the field of economic warfare by extending economic aid and furnishing all kinds of supplies, especially arms and ammunitions. In 1917 when Russia, defeated by Germany, was virtually out of the war and the Anglo-French Allies were in a very desperate position, the United States, to safeguard her own political and economic interests and also to preserve the British and French Empires by defeating Germany, entered the war.

In the present World War, the United States is a diplomatic and economic ally of Great Britain. She is nominally neutral and virtually non-belligerent, and is supplying all kinds of war materials to Germany's enemies. In the 1916 presidential election, the slogan was "he [President Wilson] kept us out of war"; and the slogan for the 1940 election is "we shall keep war away from American shores."

It is freely stated and officially recognized that Britain is the first line of defense of the U. S. A.; and thus that the people and the government of the United States should aid Britain to the fullest extent, *short of war*. It should be recognized that the logical outcome of this policy is that if Britain becomes incapable of defending herself and overwhelmed with too many enemies, then the United States, to uphold the cause of national security, menaced by a German victory over Britain, must enter the war as an actual combatant to aid Britain. On this point there should be no misunderstanding.

With the surrender of France, in spite of the gallant defense of Britain by the Royal Air Force against German air attacks, Britain's position is critical. She is facing war on five fronts: (1) The battle of England; (2) the battle of the Mediterranean; (3) the battle of the Near East; (4) the battle of the Middle East; and (5) the battle of the Far East. Great Britain is not only isolated in world politics, but some parts of the Empire, particularly Ireland and India, are not inclined to extend fullest support in this struggle. Great Britain is depending largely upon American support; and America is the most important arsenal of Britain. Can Britain, single-handed, defeat the combination of Germany, Italy, Japan which are directly and indirectly supported by Soviet Russia, Spain, and other Powers? If the answer be in the negative, then the United States is facing the alternative of saving Britain either by bringing about a negotiated peace between Britain and the Axis Powers, or by entering the World War on the side of Britain. Just as President Woodrow Wilson's program of "peace without victory" was rejected, similarly any talk of a negotiated peace is classed as a "move for appeasement of dictators" and thus a sinister proposal of fifth columnists, enemies of democracy. The United States Government cannot be a party to any program of appeasement.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the administration in Washington is actively interested in checking Japan, which on the 27th of September signed an alliance with the Rome-Berlin Axis. It seems that in case of grave emergency, the United States Government may be willing to take over the responsibility of fighting for the British in the Far East against Japan. According to political, military, and naval experts in the United States, it is widely believed that because of Japan's present economic weakness caused by the war with China, a complete economic sanction against Japan or the quarantining of Japan by the Anglo-American Powers, will be sufficient to bring Japan to her knees.

Furthermore, the present American program seems to be to aid General Chiang Kai-shek's China with money, arms, and ammunition to be sent by the Burma Road, now re-opened, so that Japan will be kept heavily involved in the present China War. Then it has been suggested that a part of the U. S. Navy, supported by British naval, air, and military forces in Australia, New Zealand, and Malaya States, and also those of Dutch East Indies, will take active steps to prevent Japan from menacing the Dutch East Indies, or the British stronghold at Singapore, or any part of Southeast Asia.

The Japanese have already declared semi-officially that the re-opening of the Burma Road will be opposed by them; neither will they welcome the move of the United States of sending a part of the American navy to Singapore. It should not be overlooked that Japan has not only secured a foothold in Indo-China, but seemingly has formed an alliance with Siam to strengthen her position in relation to Burma and Malaya States. It is to be expected that Japan in the very near future will not only recognize the Chinese government of Wang Ching-wei, but possibly will sign a formal alliance with it. While Mr. Sumner Welles and other American officials are trying to secure active support of Soviet Russia against Japan, it is my firm conviction that there is greater possibility of the conclusion of a Russo-Japanese understanding to undermine the position of Britain in the Far East and the Middle East than of Russia fighting Japan to help the Anglo-American Powers.

It is quite probable that when the situation in the Far East becomes really critical, at the same time German-Italian pressure against Britain in Egypt, Syria, and other parts of the Near East will be augmented.

We should not forget that when the League of Nations, encouraged by Secretary Stimson, took a stand against Japan and censured her, Mr. Matsuoka, the then representative of Japan in the League and the present Foreign Minister of Japan, took the decisive step of Japan's quitting the League and carrying out her policy in Manchuria by inaugurating the state of Manchukuo. So far American policy of using pressure against Japan,

*These addresses were spoken over Radio Station WQXR, New York City.

short of war, has not stopped Japan. Today, not only the Japanese militarists, but the Japanese people as a whole are determined to carry out the program of expansion in East Asia. It seems to me that if the Anglo-American Powers, believing that economically-weakened Japan will not dare to oppose them, take any drastic measure or use undue pressure on Japan, then Japan will adopt retaliatory measures primarily against Great Britain, which may force the United States to go to war against Japan in defense of Britain. Thus there is every reason to believe that we are facing a war in Asia against Japan; and this war will primarily benefit Russia, Germany, and Italy, weakening Japan and the Anglo-American Powers.

II. Address by Major General William C. Rivers U. S. Army, Retired

Many Americans say that we should save French Indo-China from the Japanese. Also, that we must send the American battle fleet to Singapore to coöperate with the small British fleet and the Netherlands fleet so as to protect the Netherland East Indies from Japan.

Such persons appear to feel that there is no limit to what the United States is capable of accomplishing. They certainly fail to consider that we have only in the past few months started our armament program—the defense program. Many who talk of our protecting all of southeastern Asia have apparently failed to give consideration to the danger of our own country being attacked—attacked by way of South or Central America by a victorious Germany and Italy.

Any attempt on our part to take part in naval operations in Southeast Asia would mean that we are at war with Japan. Emphasis is given to this talk of an American-Japanese war by the fact that our fleet is retained at Hawaii, well out toward the mid-Pacific and 2,000 miles from the Canal at Panama.

Europe is far more important to us than the Far East is. The advance of totalitarianism in western Europe means much more to our institutions than anything that could happen in Southeast Asia. Our fleet ought to be safely east of the Panama Canal, probably in the Caribbean Sea, since any attack on our country will doubtless come by way of South America. The acquisition of the eight new island bases in the west Atlantic emphasizes the need for our fleet in the Atlantic.

Of course we must not fight in East Asia—because (a) we have failed, as a people and a nation, to discover in the Far East a region of vital interest to our strategic security and economic welfare; (b) the distances across the north Pacific are too great; and (c) to fight in the Far East would be deliberately to expose the United States to the danger of an attack on the Panama Canal by a victorious Germany. This latter possibility is the gravest danger to our nation. Our fighting in East Asia would not only greatly enhance this chief danger to the United States, but it would also throw Japan more and more into the arms of Germany and Italy.

Geography is of tremendous importance in the relations between nations. Speak of our fighting in East Asia, and you at once learn from the naval authorities how dependent on bases are the great costly modern fleets.

Admiral Yarnell a few years ago said to a Naval Committee of Congress: "I would say if you wanted any assurance of going to the Philippines in time of war with a reasonable chance of success, you need to build dry docks and a base in the Philippines, and you need a fleet perhaps two to one with regard to Japan."

Admiral Leahy said to the Committee two years ago: "The Navy which America now has, and which it will have when it is increased by the authority in this bill, will be seriously inadequate to the task of sending a naval force to the Philippines." The Admiral said also: "The defensive lines of the American Navy at the present time reach from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands, to Samoa and to the Panama Canal."

Send our fleet to Singapore to work with the British fleet, when we all know that Britain has had no capital ship east of Suez since the bomb explosion at Agadir in 1911! It would stagger the imagination to figure the number of merchant ships that would be required to supply our fleet at Singapore. A far greater number than the total number of merchant vessels in all our foreign trade.

A student of experience has just published his views on the Far East. Robert Aura Smith's book, *Our Future in Asia,* is just out. Mr. Smith is frankly an imperialist in his view. He feels that we have a very important position in the Far East. Also, that we ought to retain the Philippines as a dominion. He states: "Our greatest peril is not the danger of fighting a naval war too far from our shores. It is that we should resign ourselves to defeat without putting up a fight." Very brave words, indeed. The author, a civilian, differs from the experts of our navy on fighting a war 7,000 miles from our west coast and 5,000 miles from our base at Hawaii.

The author makes much of our trade in the Far East. He draws with compass a circle with a radius of 1,000 miles and the center between Saigon and Borneo. There you have safely in the circle 130,000,000 customers in the South China Sea. But he omits to state that we sell to a customer in the North China Sea, Japan, almost double the amount we sell to his three colonies in the South: Hong Kong, Dutch East Indies, and the Philippines. Mr. Smith emphasizes that we get 850,000 tons of sugar yearly from the Philippines, but omits to state that we take the Philippine sugar as a favor to the Filipinos; that we can buy that sugar cheaper in Cuba or in Hawaii. The same with many other things we get from the Philippines—we can buy them in tropical lands to the south of the United States. We sell abroad only 8 per cent of the manufactured articles and foodstuffs we produce. Eastern Asia, in which is included the Philippines, buys only 10 per cent of what we export.

It is a familiar illusion that teeming millions insure a great trade. Yet we sell at our door to Canada, with a population about the same as that of greater New York, far more goods than we sell the Far East—from Vladivostok to Java. There is as yet no great trade in the Far East. Decades and decades will have to pass. We do have considerable trade with Japan. That trade is I suppose our vital interest in the Far East. Our trade with Japan is far greater than our trade with China and the Philippines combined. Our trade with Japan has a balance favorable to us. The balance is unfavorable to the United States in its trade with both China and the Philippines. The favorable balance in our trade with Japan compensates for the unfavorable balance in our trade with the twenty nations to the south of the United States.

We loudly acclaim that the people who live on the

two continents of America shall settle the future of these two continents. It is fair and also inevitable that the people who live in East Asia shall settle the future of East Asia. Call it a Monroe Doctrine for the Far East—or by any other name—I see no other way for quiet in the Far East.

III. Address by J. Max Weis
Director of Research, World Peaceways

Why is the United States facing war in Asia? Five attitudes on our part are responsible. First of all, we hear it said that we must keep the British and Dutch possessions out of Japan's control if we want to have an ample supply of rubber and tin.

In the second place, you have our determination to preserve the Far East, with its billion people—one-half the world's population—as a market for our exports.

A third reason is the suggestion that the only way by which we can be sure that we shall not be the last democracy on earth is by preventing the British and Dutch possessions, and China, from falling into Japanese hands.

In the fourth place, we think it good strategy to face the Japanese now, while they are entangled with China, instead of facing a Japan that will be stronger when she is through conquering China and the territories of the British and the Dutch.

The fifth reason lies in our insistence that treaties, signed between Japan and ourselves, shall not be broken.

Let us see which of these five reasons, or what combination of them, is likely to drive us to war with Japan. The southeastern Asiatic region yields 40 per cent of all the products we now import. These products are largely rubber and tin. Steps have already been taken by our nation to replace the possible loss of those supplies. We now have a six months' supply of rubber on hand. We are increasing the production of substitute rubber and are stimulating its planting in Latin America. Experts agree that, if it became necessary, we could get along without Asia's rubber. It would cost a lot of money to do it. But it also costs a lot of money to fight a war in Asia.

We have nine months' supply of tin on hand, with access to the tin of Bolivia. We could get along without tin from Asia.

As for tungsten, we have a year's supply. We have a natural substitute for tungsten, if we should be required to use it. As for Asia's silk, we could get along without it, in these days of rayon, nylon, and other items.

Certainly, on the basis of these facts, we shall hardly be driven to war in Asia.

Now we come to that matter of trade. Is it vital that we safeguard East Asia as an outlet for our goods? Do we need that market for our own prosperity, to provide jobs and income for our workers? A prominent industrialist, at the head of the export organization of General Motors, Mr. Graeme K. Howard, answers "No." He has presented his views in a book published only yesterday, entitled *America and a New World Order*. Mr. Howard believes that "the exports of industrial consumer goods, which formed so large a part of the international trade of the past, will materially decline." He expects consumer goods to be manufactured within national boundaries and within regional blocs. He sees no reason why Brazil, for example, should be condemned eternally to be an agricultural nation, waiting for countries to buy her coffee and cotton.

As a matter of fact, Brazil has already taken two big steps in the direction indicated by Mr. Howard. Brazil has persuaded us to expand her steel industry and she has made a deal with Argentina—there is your regional arrangement—whereby those two South American countries undertake to purchase each other's industrial and agricultural products. That, says Mr. Howard, is what will happen throughout the world, including the Far East. Instead of exporting industrial consumer goods, we shall be exporting largely raw materials and capital goods, the goods that are the product of high tooling costs and a long background of engineering science. For our industrial consumer products, we shall have our mass market here at home and the countries adjacent to us.

We certainly cannot dismiss the testimony of Mr. Howard, especially when we observe that Australia is expanding her industries and expects to sell in that Asiatic market; that India is expanding her industrial production—not to mention the future industrial operations of Japan, China, and Russia. The total sales we may expect in East Asia certainly do not justify a war at the cost of billions of dollars. That area would still be inclined to buy from us the materials it cannot obtain elsewhere. I can see no justification for our going to war in East Asia to preserve jobs and prosperity for the workers and investors of the United States.

Now, let us look at the third reason: that we shall prevent our becoming the last democracy on earth if we stop the Japanese. That idea has just been advanced by Mr. Robert Aura Smith, a New York *Times* correspondent, in his new book mentioned by General Rivers. Mr. Smith argues that the democracies of Great Britain and the Netherlands have been able to exist only because of their Asiatic possessions. If we stand by and let Japan take their Asiatic possessions, the Netherlands and Great Britain will lose the rich supporting foundation for their national existence and will therefore disappear. We shall then become the last of the democracies. Mr. Smith employs the same argument in respect to China. We must rescue China in order to have democratic company on this globe. I cannot agree with Mr. Smith that by saving China, we shall rescue a nation that will be a democracy like our own. It is more likely to resemble the Soviet Union. I have no quarrel on that point. The Chinese are assuredly entitled to the kind of political and economic organization they are free to choose. But we must not deceive ourselves into expecting that, by fighting to keep China out of Japan's grasp, we shall preserve in Asia an exact or nearly exact counterpart of the United States.

I should like to see the Chinese escape the clutches of a militarized Japan. But how are we to do it? Are we determined to rescue the Chinese from the Soviet Union, as well? What is the program that our government should aim at? The Russians would not relish our gaining an undue measure of influence in China. Would we move to stamp the Russian influence out of China if and when we succeeded in crushing the Japanese? Would we pledge Great Britain to stand with her at the gates of India to prevent the Russians from moving to the banks of the Ganges? Where and when would it end?

We should stop to weigh what chain of responsibili-

ties and challenges may face us if we commit ourselves to rescuing China. Can we afford to drain ourselves of the man power that such a program would necessarily destroy?

What about preserving Dutch and British ownership of Asiatic territories as a necessary foundation for the prosperous life of Great Britain and the Netherlands, and thereby ensure their continuance as democracies? In the instance of the Netherlands, we should have to march into Europe to restore the Netherlands to the Dutch people.

The fourth reason why we face war in Asia is because a section of our citizens accept the thesis advanced in the *Herald-Tribune* by Mr. Walter Lippmann. He holds that "if we merely sit still and do nothing to check the conquest of the Far East, we shall not be growing stronger; we shall in fact be growing weaker."

Let us quote further from Mr. Lippmann's column to clarify his point. At the present time, points out Mr. Lippmann, "the Germans are being blockaded and bombed, the Italians are confined to their harbors, and . . . the Japanese are entangled in their long Chinese war." Under those conditions, they are shouting defiance at us and are already suggesting the stipulations under which we shall be allowed to function on this earth. If they are that dictatorial now, Mr. Lippmann wants to know what they would do and say to us after Japan became master of East Asia.

There is developing the conviction that we must not only stop Japan now, but also the confidence that we are equal to the job of doing it, with the use of Singapore and Australian ports by our navy. There is one big question mark in the whole Asiatic setup: Russia. What would Russia do if we went to war in the Far East? Is Russia so eager to destroy the British influence in Asia that she would even make a deal with Japan? Unless and until that question is satisfactorily answered to the American people, I believe our government has no right to lead the American people to believe that a war in Asia would be child's play for us.

Finally, there is the matter of treaties violated by Japan. That is a long story. They say in Washington that our Secretary of State has taken a firm stand on that platform of principle and that he is inclined to disregard all considerations as to whether this nation is able to fight for the principle involved in Asia.

I cannot predict which set of considerations will become paramount with Washington. Our citizens can influence the decision of Washington if they will demand full information on the several problems I have presented. We are definitely facing a choice between war and some bold policy in Asia that may eventually lead up to war, unless we decide that our primary job is to keep the Atlantic free and peaceful.

Selling Pacifism

MYLES D. BLANCHARD

Most pacifists base their position on ethical and moral grounds. Their refusal to kill is rooted in a firm conviction that to do so would be to violate certain self-imposed or, in the case of the religious man, God-imposed standards. As a practical appeal to the average man we are forced to admit that pacifism with such a background simply does not click. In a world that defies about all moral and ethical values, it is not easy to convince many people that pacifism is "the way" simply because it possesses a certain rightness.

The question then arises as to whether pacifism can be made to appeal to the masses on the basis that it is expedient, and here we have a problem that is not easy of solution. Let us see how we might go about selling pacifism to the man on the street.

To begin with, why would it not be proper to suggest pacifism as a way out of war on the basis that it has never been tried? Senator Lodge of Massachusetts took to the air recently and proclaimed his conviction that the duty of the United States was to arm to the extent that it would become impregnable. We do not know how much of a student of history the Senator may be, but we defy him to discover one instance of a nation arming itself to the point that no other nation dared attack it. The obvious must be seen, that if such had ever been the case some nation would stand out today as never having been guilty of making war or of having been the victim of another nation's aggression. But, search our memories as we may, we can think of no nation that has insured peace for itself by the simple expedient of maintaining a huge army and navy.

As a matter of record, the reverse is true. Mighty armies make for mighty wars. One has but to look at Europe today to see the result of armament races. Mr. Chamberlain stalled at Munich for the sole purpose of making England impregnable, yet as this is being written millions of Londoners are in constant danger of death, the entire economic, political, and social life of the island has been upset, and the danger of invasion is not over. Just how much more time, we are led to ask, and how much larger would England's army and navy have needed to be before she could have scared Germany out of attacking her? And then comes the reminder that it was England and not Germany who declared war. Most certainly, then, had England not had the year after Munich in which to build an "impregnable" military force there would have been no war between Germany and England, at any rate.

France had an "impregnable" army and a line of defense, the Maginot Line, which, we were told, would insure the perpetual peace and safety of that country. And yet no such result occurred. Frenchmen gave their lives in a vain attempt to make the huge military machine effective and still the result is a denuded France. The same argument can be used in the case of China, Poland, and Finland. Their armies and armaments did not save them, and today they lie wrecked and ruined nations, far more effectively wrecked than had they never built and shot a gun. They are for practical purposes obliterated, despite the "insurance" they so greatly believed in. In other words, all the promises of the world's militarists that only a strong army can make for peace are battered silly by what has happened in the past year.

But we can hear gasps of shocked amazement by now. "Look at Denmark! Look at the Netherlands! Look at Paris!" All right, but before we look at Paris let us look at London. Is London, drenched in blood,

hurrying to bury its dead before another aerial attack is made, any prettier sight than Paris? What satisfaction is it to a Londoner to look at a wrecked cathedral, a sonless mother, or a shattered veteran, even when in so doing he mutters to himself, "But I kept my pride. I fought!" Is the Britisher any better because, on top of destruction, he has killed? Is he any better than the Dane who chose not to kill? There may be some question here. We can hear mutterings about national pride, the right to defend one's self, the principles of democracy, and, alas, the future of Christianity. But still we are not convinced. National pride, for example, is one of the main factors in all wars. We "saved" democracy a quarter of a century ago, only to find that we have not much of any left. If it is a mere matter of self-defense, the German has as much right along that line as the Britisher; and as for Christianity and this war, perhaps the less said the better.

Again the cry is raised, "Would you have Britain invaded and captured by the Germans?" This is the most difficult argument to answer. Forgetting for a few moments that Britain has invaded every continent in the world and subjugated every inferior nation she could, let us look at Great Britain who is fighting Germany and at Denmark who did not fight. Are the people of Denmark less happy than the people of Great Britain? Are the fathers and mothers of Denmark suffering as are their cousins in Britain? Has an equal amount of public and private property been destroyed? Admitting for the moment that Denmark has become a submerged and nearly forgotten nation, is she worse off than Britain? If she is, then war becomes ethical and we should all partake in it; but if she is not, then submission to a tyrant is, for the moment, better strategy than slaying innocent millions to eradicate one tyrant only to see another fill his place.

Here again the cry of morals is raised. Is it moral to submit to tyranny? But the answer must be in the form of another question. Is it moral to kill? Perhaps morals, as we have said, should be left out of the question entirely, since the moment we enter any war under any pretext, morals must be forgotten.

We are forced to maintain that Denmark is in better shape today than Great Britain. She has her sons on her own soil; she has her buildings intact. But more than that, she has hope, a hope that does not spring out of the use of force but out of a sure reliance on the inevitability of righteousness. She still has "the power of the spirit," not only an untried weapon when used by itself, but a totally unknown weapon insofar as Adolf Hitler is concerned.

Just what are we trying to say, some one inquires. Very simply, this: out of the present conflict, neither Germany nor England can possibly emerge as victors. Furthermore, no nation entering this conflict can expect to come out of it on top. It is not in the nature of modern war that those engaging in it win anything. Hitlerism is not going to be destroyed by smashing at innocent German people in Berlin, and the British bulldoggedness is not going to be broken by attacking London. But both nations can destroy everything fine and noble by merely continuing what they have started, refusing to call it quits because of pride.

Whereas we are free to predict that Hitlerism cannot be destroyed by British militarism, we are just as free to predict that it will meet its end in a very effective manner. It will not be finished off by guns, more guns, and yet more guns, but will come to its end through the practice of a philosophy preached by a man in India, the doctrine of passive resistance. India has had no war with Great Britain, Great Britain has had no war with India, not because of a set of supermorals possessed by Britishers, but because they know of no way to meet Gandhi's tactics. If anybody doubts the efficacy of pacifism he need go no farther than India to discover whether it works or not. And in exactly the same manner that England has been stalemated by some brown-skinned pacifists, Hitler's entire program of dominating Europe can be scuttled. All the low countries need to do within the next few weeks is to stage a sit-down strike, and the bread basket of Hitlerism will be no more. Hitler can slay and whip and order around, but "the power of the spirit" will have defeated him before he begins.

This argument, it seems, puts pacifism on a basis which might be comprehended by a larger number of people. Admitted it will not win over some men who seem but a few paces from the jungle anyway and who love war for the excuse it offers to commit murder! Admitted that some will raise strenuous objection to it on the basis that it savours of appeasement! But after all has been said and done, is not the chief desire of the world to be free of Hitler and his heirs? And have not all methods tried to date failed? Why, then, we ask, should we not try pacifism? Who dares to say, in view of the failure of militarism, that it would not succeed? And how can we be so certain before we try?

Ballad

Fifty ships from west to east
Across the ocean sped,
Carrying guns and arms to swell
The score of Europe's dead,
While the hungry cried, in every land:
"Give us not guns but bread!"

High and thick were the watery walls
The battling warlords made,
But not one ship from west to east
Would run the dread blockade
With food packed in its lunging hold
For mercy's kind crusade.

Fifty ships from east to west
Sailed back across the seas,
Flying aloft the yellow flag,
The sign of swift disease,—
Their crews, dim ghosts of Europe's dead,
Had been left to starve and freeze.

No fort, no mine, no shell could keep
Those phantom ships away;
They dumped their bales of pestilence
On every beach and bay
Of the land that sowed in a foreign field
The dust of its own decay.

Edith Lovejoy Pierce.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXV

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, in her syndicated newspaper column, "My Day," published recently the following:

Yesterday afternoon a group of people, some Quakers, both middle-aged and young men, spent a couple of hours with me explaining the point of view of the various conscientious objectors. They were anxious to make me realize that theirs was a genuine conviction, that they could not take human lives, and some of them even felt they could not engage in any activity sponsored by a government which they felt was tending toward war.

None of these men, young or old, had to convince me of their sincerity. I can well understand that to live up to these convictions will perhaps take more courage than to risk their lives in the army. Yet I can also see the point of view of other people whose boys are in the army or who are in the army themselves if a war should ever come, particularly of a defensive nature.

The test of democracy and civilization is to treat with fairness the individual's right to self-expression, even when you can neither understand nor approve it. I hope we are going to show now, when we simply are asking young men to train for useful purposes in peacetime or in any emergency, that we can respect individuals who differ from the majority and find useful work which they are willing and able to do under the restrictions imposed upon them by their conscience.

The British government in India has forbidden agitation on behalf of pacifism, or non-violent resistance. The Congress has organized a test of this edict by systematic disobedience, and arrests have begun.

Eight outstanding students of the Union Theological Seminary in New York refused to register on Registration Day on the ground of conscientious objection to war. These students have been summoned before the Grand Jury for possible indictment. Twelve other students of Union registered as conscientious objectors only after resigning from the Seminary in order to escape exemption under the law as theological students.

The Associated Press publishes the following dispatch from Boston, Massachusetts:

Less than eighteen hours after the close of selective military service registration, two Back Bay ministers were indicted by a Federal Grand Jury today on a charge of knowingly failing and neglecting to register.

The indictments named the Reverend Keith C. Kanaga, 25, assistant pastor of the Mount Vernon Congregational Church, and the Reverend Harry H. Kruener, 24, pastor of the First Baptist Church.

Warrants were not issued, but Federal Attorney Edmund J. Brandon said the ministers had assured him they would be available for questioning or summons at the court's convenience.

Registration officials said the two had appeared at a registration place yesterday and refused to register. Both attempted to leave statements explaining their action, but officials declined to accept them.

The clergymen said at that time that they were ready to face any government investigation of their stand.

Fellowship, organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, publishes the following:

Following publication last month of the statement by 307 ministers affirming their readiness to counsel and support those who cannot conscientiously coöperate in the operation of a conscription act, one hundred and fifty-six additional pastors have signed the statement. Among the nationally known names in the group are H. D. Bollinger, J. Henry Carpenter, James Crain, Albert E. Day, Kirby Page, and Ralph Sockman.

Nofrontier News Service reports the following from London, England:

Contrary to the expectations long voiced by critics, the British Fellowship of Reconciliation, Christian pacifist movement, reports that although it has had some wartime resignations, totalling between 200 and 250 members, the year that elapsed since the war began has seen a great accession of new members, totalling more than 3,000, while 400 former members who had drifted away have returned. Thus the membership is at its highest in a long time—13,000. Every age group and every section of the country is represented in the increase, which officials say has been largely spontaneous.

At a Conscientious Objectors' dedication meeting held at the Broadway Tabernacle in New York on the morning of Registration Day (October 16), the following pledge was spoken by the assembled company:

On this day when our country is taking what we believe to be an overt step in the direction of war and dictatorship we reaffirm our conscientious objection to both of these evils. We are convinced that unless man renounces these methods, his virtual destruction lies ahead. A society of brotherhood can be built only through love, respect and non-violent action. To put our belief into practice we dedicate ourselves to the fight to keep America out of war; to the fight to stop our country's drive toward dictatorship; to the task of building a new society that knows no racial, political, or economic barrier and is established on love and self-sacrifice; and to the task of building a movement to train for and to put into practice methods of non-violent direct action.

The New Age, a religious journal published in Montreal, Canada, says the following:

How hard in these days must it be for the Christian Church, toiling in the midst of disturbing and deflecting war passions, to do her work as the messenger of good will and brotherhood. How well-nigh impossible must it be for Christian Ministers to preach the gospel of universal love. With what difficulty can they preserve their gatherings from becoming witnesses to narrow nationalisms, race hatred, hot retaliation, and all other things of which the gospel is the blank contradiction. In their hands is the one hope of a war-cursed world. "When the hurly-burly's done and the battle's fought and won," the nations will have to return to some form of reason and good will. The end of the war should be a good peace. The churches can best serve the nations by struggling hard to be true to their task. There is no such thing worthy of them as a gospel of heated nationalism. They must continue in the face of hell to preach a gospel of brotherhood. * * *

Preachers because of the hardness of their task need not give themselves up to war sermons, trailing the gospel behind and beneath the flag. Even a regiment of soldiers would rather be spiritually uplifted and morally braced. Churches that are making themselves temples of Mars are on the wrong track. For their own country, even in wartime, they have a far grander work to do. By doing it, they will prove themselves not only Christian leaders, but patriots of the high order.

Consumers' Cooperation, official national journal of the Consumers Cooperative Movement in this country, publishes the following editorial:

We dislike to face what we are doing and generally gloss over the naked truth with deceptive words. That is why we like the straightforward statement of the president of the Caterpillar Tractor Company, who surely ought to know what the building of tanks means, when he speaks of "building billions of dollars worth of slaughter machines." This is realism. It is in accord with the American Youth Council statement which speaks of setting apart young men trained to kill and risk being killed. It is in line with the New York *Daily News* editorial which urges that young men be trained

to be "brutes." "Slaughter machines, men killers and brutes" —they are the means of Capitalism, Communism, and Fascism —not the means of Cooperation. Cooperation develops by education and persuasion—not by bayonets, bullets and bombs.

The *Christian Century* reports the following:

Speaking at a New Haven forum on "theological education in a world at war," Lawson Willard of Trinity Episcopal Church criticized the inconsistency of theologians who condemn war in peacetime but "jump on the bandwagon" in a crisis. He suggested that since the church had taken a definite stand it should stand on its stand.

The *Christian Century* publishes the following report of the Annual Peace Workers Conference in Media, Pennsylvania:

Quakers were urged to be true to their convictions and traditions. It was recommended that representatives from all Quaker meetings visit their local draft boards to present their Quaker viewpoint, but that no Friend should serve on a registration or draft board for military conscription. "It is not enough to protest against conscription, not enough to clean up messes throughout the world," Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, told the conference. "Quakers must be concerned for a creative world. This is our most important function. We are feeding 25,000 regularly in France," he stated. "Outside of one American Red Cross worker, we are the only continuing organization still in Germany. Quaker meetings are functioning in Germany, Holland, Denmark, Prague, Vienna, and Paris."

The Associated Press reports the following from Durham, New Hampshire:

Under a wooden slab bearing the inscription, "Here lie temporarily interred my hopes of peace and democracy in the United States," a score of pacifist books, poems, and manuscripts were buried last night.

They were laid away in a small box in a grave dug with a kitchen spoon by their author, Agnes Ryan Stevens, of Durham, a longtime worker for peace. She said the interment "without benefit of clergy or mourners" on the eve of the first peacetime military conscription in the United States was a coincidence and that she was opposed only to war.

Declaring that the small "casket" contained material "for which the world temporarily moving backward, is not ready," the slab inscription added: "For these slain hopes shed no useless tears and mourn not in vain. Weep not, despair not, for the spirit of peace cannot perish and eventually these hopes shall rise again."

The Study Table

Great Preachers

MASTER SERMONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. *Edited by Gaius Glenn Atkins. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company.* $2.00.

Here is a superb anthology of great sermons, edited by an authority in the homiletical field who is himself one of the outstanding preachers of this day. Limiting his survey to the last century, Dr. Atkins has chosen thirteen preachers, and presented a single sermon from each man. Thus, Thomas Chalmers is represented by his immortal "The Expulsive Power of a New Affection," William Ellery Channing by what is undoubtedly his greatest if not historically his most important discourse, "Spiritual Freedom," James Martineau by "The Witness of God with Our Spirit," Phillips Brooks by "The Pillar in God's Temple," and so on. The other preachers included in this generous volume are John Henry Newman, James Bowling Mozley, Henry Ward Beecher, Frederick William Robertson, Horace Bushnell, Matthew Simpson, John Caird, Charles Haddon, and Dwight Lyman Moody. Each sermon is preceded by a brief introduction, which is in each case admirable not only as presenting the biographical outline of the preacher in question but also as offering a genuine if necessarily sketchy study of the preacher's personality and power. I do not know when, if ever, I have read more excellent editorial material.

The first criticism, of course, that rises to meet any anthology, be it of poems, plays, short stories, detective yarns, or sermons, is the challenge—why did you include this and why did you exclude that? Dr. Atkins meets this challenge with convincing candor in his Introduction. Thus, there are limitations of space—the editor cannot include every man with claims to recognition! Then there is the necessity of getting "a representative balance of style, subject matter, nationality, and . . . the various Protestant communions." The editor himself can make no boast of infallibility, which is "the final and covering answer." To which may still be added the flat reminder that the editor is making his own selection, and not somebody else's! Yet, with each and all of these explanations given due weight, I must still insist that there is one omission in this volume which is inexcusable. I refer to Theodore Parker. It may well be that, having generously included two Unitarians in his list of thirteen preachers, the editor felt he could not properly include another. There is also the fact that, to the accomplished homiletical expert, Parker's sermons are roughly written, and read with no such effect as they must have been heard. But Parker is a preacher who defies all limitations and overwhelms all faults and failings. For a dozen years he preached to the largest congregations that ever listened regularly to an American preacher, with the possible exception of Beecher. For two decades he made his pulpit an unexampled power in the land, and his sermons are many of them unforgettable documents of the times. His religious utterances have a passion, a beauty, an exaltation which give them perpetual significance. We know of no preacher of any century whose transcendent gifts are more needed in these desperate times. Dr. Atkins' preachers are all well selected—but the list still remains woefully defective and incomplete without Parker.

One other matter! Dr. Atkins found three of his sermon masterpieces—those of Chalmers, Channing and Beecher—embarrassingly long. These three discourses were themselves "long enough to make a small volume." So he took the drastic measure of abridging them. We admire his courage and his skill. If this thing is to be done at all, I do not see how it could have been done better. But should it be done? Has not an acknowledged masterpiece a right to be seen in its integrity, exactly as it was conceived and presented by its author? Is there any more sense in cutting down a great sermonic discourse to fit the limitations of a published volume, than there would be in cutting down a great picture to fit the limitations of a wall space? I am not sure. It seems wrong. Yet as I reread Channing's sermon on "Spiritual Freedom" in its

abbreviated form, I cannot see that much harm has been done. It seems to hold together, and loses nothing of its power. On the other hand, I feel that Chalmers' "The Expulsive Power of a New Affection" has been irreparably damaged. There was a quality in Chalmers, as Dr. Atkins points out in his Introduction, which was essentially repetitive. He went 'round and 'round a subject instead of through it. Carlyle spoke of his sermons as "the triumphant onrush of one idea with its satellites and supporters." The very glory of Chalmers, in other words, was his reiterative detail. And it is this very detail which is inevitably cut away in any work of abridgement. I can only say that I would never have believed that Chalmers' masterpiece could be made to appear so unimportant. As I reread it in this volume, I never would have suspected that it was one of the great sermons of all times, nor even that it was great at all. Which means that we have a problem here! Should a great sermon be cut? Can one imagine an editor omitting lines or stanzas from Keats' "Ode to a Nightingale" to fit the limitations of a poetry anthology. Should it not, in one case as in the other, be all or nothing? Here is a theme for discussion in homiletics classes this winter.

Dr. Atkins has published a book which places all preachers, and I hope many laymen, in his debt. This review must end with a word not of criticism, but of admiration and gratitude.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

An American Humanitarian

HELEN HUNT JACKSON. *By Ruth Odell. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.* 326 *pp.* $3.00.

This, the first important biography of Helen Hunt Jackson, is dedicated rightfully to Louise Pound, the author of the sketch of H. H. in the Dictionary of American Biography. The author, like Miss Pound, is on the English staff at the University of Nebraska. All in all, the book is a most excellent piece of research that was greatly needed. Helen Hunt Jackson was one of America's noblest women. During her life she shunned publicity, and, before her death in Colorado Springs, she requested that Hamilton Wright Mabie write her biography if one were to be written. Mabie died without performing the task, and Helen Hunt Jackson has waited until now for a definitive biography.

Helen Hunt Jackson was poet, novelist, and humanitarian. Her father, professor of classical languages at Amherst, gave her the right start in life, a genuine love for literature. In Amherst she was a neighbor of Emily Dickinson, and the two lives have been entwined both for good and evil: for good, in that they were lifelong friends; for evil, in that Josephine Pollitt in 1930 popularized the falsehood that Emily and Major Hunt were in love with each other. But the exact opposite was the truth. The relatives of Mrs. Jackson have maintained the tradition that Major Hunt rather disliked Emily, and the Dickinson family, as the present reviewer can say from first-hand knowledge, have preserved the memory that there never was any interest either on Emily's part for Hunt, nor on his part for her. Miss Odell has once for all disposed of the Pollitt myth.

Beginning in 1865, Helen Hunt Jackson wrote steadily until her death in Colorado Springs in 1885. Everybody, even the most illiterate movie fan, knows her *Ramona,* but few understand her importance as one of the first American humanitarians. Her efforts on behalf of the cheated and despised Indian will be remembered after her poems, reviews, and novels (except *Ramona*) are all forgotten. A sincere and genuine interest in the "least of these" strangely but surely has its reward. Today many pilgrims visit the grave in Evergreen Cemetery, whither the body of Helen Hunt Jackson had to be removed from her chosen site on beautiful Cheyenne Mountain because of the vandalism of her fellow Americans, and read the simple inscription with the one word "Emigravit." And that one word sums up the spirit of the one who rests below, for her spirit is still abroad. Miss Odell has done a superb job, and with the constant increase of interest in American letters her work will enjoy a just reward.

C. A. HAWLEY.

"Conflict"

CONFLICT. *By Richard Bowler, Jr. Richmond, Virginia: The William Byrd Press, Inc.* 351 *pp.* $2.50.

It is an axiom in the literary world that propaganda novels are rarely successful. Whether Richard Bowler, Jr., set out deliberately to write a propaganda novel when he wrote *Conflict* is doubtful, but in any event, he has achieved a rare success in presenting a story that is a synthesis of powerful preachment and literary charm.

It is quite possible that only a "success d'estime" has been actually achieved rather than best-seller status, although your reviewer would prefer this book to most of the current best sellers.

Industrial inadequacy in an admittedly imperfect democracy is argued with clarity and force, intermingled with a personal story of love at its highest, of great and unusual charm—the joy of which is heightened when comparison is made with the welter of sophisticated sex stories which mark most modern novels.

The setting is a small community in the Blue Ridge Mountains; the story, the declaration of allegiance to the workers' cause of the scion of a wealthy mill owner, the dire result of such intellectual honesty and its devastating effect upon the family.

Edward Dardeen had a stormy voyage to endure before he could reorganize the family paper mill—upon such a basis as to be fair to labor as well as capital—and his turmoil is mitigated only by the contemporaneous and successful wooing of a kinswoman, Sally Dardeen. He finally achieves a measure of industrial peace with honor and his well-earned triumph in love. He and Sally deserve to live happily ever after.

It is, of course, all a parable of modern life with its inextricable industrial and social unrest and discontent argued from a definitely sound sociological basis and yet woven into a human idyll of tenderness and ecstasy. An unusual novel demanding attention from men and women who are not callous to human woe and yet not cynical about human perfectibility.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

Wish in Wartime

Would that the world were but a cloud
To dissipate, dispel
Its gauzy mass, and prove itself
An insubstantial Hell.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Correspondence

The War, the East, and America

Editor of UNITY:

Harold P. Marley's article in your issue of October 7 is one of the best things that I have seen in print in many months, particularly his statements that Hitler in Europe "is merely pushing down a system which was ready to fall anyway"; and the other, apropos of the Fuehrer, "He has no intention of joining [our ships] in combat *over here*."

As regards the old order which is being wrecked in Europe, it is well to bring to the minds of Americans right now a statement made thirty-two years ago by Benjamin Kidd, one of England's greatest economists. To a distinguished Oxford audience, he said, with great deliberation (he thus described his words a few years later), "The world into which you were born is dead. Some of you who are young will live to see remarkable happenings." He realized the wrongness of the Boer War and what it foreshadowed. He did not live to see the beginning of India's non-violent endeavor to free herself from empire-control—a struggle that is still going on. That last is one reason why the war is moving east as some of us have been saying all along it must and would. But—we were not given much chance in the metropolitan press to say this. The interests at home and abroad that want to fill us with fear and mistaken ideas of all kinds had the right of way and hammered into our heads the idea that war was going to move toward our shores. If so, it will have to circumnavigate the globe to get here! The Balkans, the Holy Land (and incidentally Britain's oil supply), Gibraltar, Somaliland, the Suez —they all lie to the east. Are we going to be mad enough to follow the war into the East? And is it our object to help perpetuate western imperial domination,—perhaps to assist in forging new shackles for Gandhi's India? Or, are we going to constitute ourselves the guardian of Singapore? Or, is the U. S. A. simply the uneasy restless soldier-boy all dressed up and no place to go? We ordinary folks are not told; but there is one thing we ought to know without being told: we are in a serious situation, one in which our own present and future should engage us rather than Europe's past.

BLANCHE WATSON.

New York City.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

If the British war office refuses to allow the food ships to convey their precious cargoes to the rest of Europe, what's to happen? Must the will of God be ignored if the war office objects to its fulfillment?

It may be that the British government would welcome the whole conception as an honorable way out of a situation which is fast ruining both protagonists! But of course they would take a firm stand against the project at first. They would probably complain that the U. S. A. was interfering in European affairs, meddling with mercy instead of munitions.

It may be, on the other hand, that the War Office would consider the plan tragically misconceived, and characterize it "sentimental, naive, idealistic." They may implore you to desist, point out that it would be a stab in the back, actually as mortal as Mussolini's. They may use all the psychological methods known to governments to rebuff you to impugn your motives, your good faith.

To the military mind, both British and American, it may look like treachery. But most human beings don't possess the military mind. Ordinary people look at things differently. This often creates awkward situations for the ordinary person. It may also create awkward situations for the militarist. In this situation they may feel so sincere a dread of the scheme that they have to inform the U. S. A. that they are bound to keep the food ships out of Europe, by force if necessary; that they must sink any ship that defies the blockade. They would be within their rights if they did this. In which case, the U. S. A. would send the ships regardless, for they would be manned by Americans, millions of whom would gladly risk death in the effort to save life and to introduce a new technique for the settling of international problems.

Seeing that it is a common human instinct to feed the hungry, what political or military consideration will be able to hold back the stream of generosity, once the old confining dams have broken down?

MURIEL LESTER.

(With acknowledgments to Jane Addams from whose book *Bread and Peace* most of these ideas have been taken.)

The Liquor Situation in the United States

GEORGE L. THOMPSON

An important factor in the consideration of any major problem of general interest is the attitude of the public. This is especially true in regard to the present-day liquor situation in the United States.

It is now eight years since the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution was repealed, and it is to be feared that most people are somewhat hazy in regard to the real situation.

Perhaps this apathy is due to a natural reaction resulting from a weariness produced by a plethora of high-powered propaganda during the campaign for repeal.

It may be the result of mental confusion brought about by the chaotic state of the laws following the prohibition period, during which many of the old laws had been erased from the statute books, or the general cultural breakdown in the post-war period. Again, there has been a sense of disappointment resulting from high hopes raised when the advocates of repeal promised a social Utopia when liquor should once more flow unrestrained under the watchful eye of paternal legislators and officials.

Finally, we suspect that there is considerable ignorance in regard to the true conditions.

We may then inquire: What are the actual facts?

A careful study of official reports and reliable data reveals the situation as follows: During the past decade there has been an enormous increase in the importation, production and consumption of intoxicants in this country.

Statistics make dull reading to most people, but we may cite as an example the increase in liquor imports from abroad. In 1932 the official returns give their value as $300,000; in 1937, $57,700,000. The manufacture of distilled and brewed liquors shows a similar increase.

This is only a part of the story. Apart from the legalized production of liquor, moonshining and bootlegging is reaching a new high peak. While profits of illegal liquor traffic are smaller in percentage than during the prohibition era, the ease in evading prosecution compensates the loss. The U. S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue reported 256 legal distilleries operating in 1938. During the same year the Department seized 11,407 illegal stills. Last year the number seized increased to 12,058. Competent observers estimate that not more than one-fourth of the total number were apprehended. Even the director of the Distilled Spirits Institute recently made the conservative estimate of 25,600 illegal distilleries in operation.

Space does not permit any detailed statement concerning the great number of retail dealers in the country operating taverns, cafes, stores, etc., which dispense drinks.

In this article our primary interest is in the ethical and religious effects of this flood of intoxicants. Such being the case we may well note the effect on vital statistics. We may compare the number of deaths from alcohol with those caused by war. From the most reliable sources available we find that since France and England declared war on Germany in 1939, more people have died from alcoholism, accidents due to drunken driving and similar causes, in this country than the total lost in battle by the two great powers mentioned. The story is told by the official returns giving the number of deaths from alcoholism in 1931 as 3,933. Six years later they had increased to 10,960.

No one contends that liquor drinking or liquor dealing is conducive to good morals, yet it is estimated that 3,000,000 young women are employed directly or indirectly in the liquor trade, a large proportion in retail establishments where they are subject to pernicious influences.

In view of the facts set forth above we ask: Is this a matter which we can afford to ignore? Should the churches remain apathetic concerning it? Is it not time for us to awake and consider our own responsibility concerning the situation?

Christian Leader.